

SOCIALISM

AND

The Worker.



Price 5 Cents.

Sold by F. A. SORGE, Box 101 Hoboken, N. J.

NEW YORK, 1876.

Printed by JOHN WEBER, 64 Chatham Street.

3071151

1000000

1000000

1000000

1000000

1000000

COMMUNIST 25 22 Jan 18 PALMER

Socialism has been attacked and incriminated at all times, but never with more animosity than recently. Socialists are reproached of every kind of wickedness: of the tendency to do away with property, marriage, family, to pollute every thing that is sacred; they have been even accused of arson and murder. And why not? If we look at the originators of those incriminations, we are not the least astonished, for they have to defend privileges and monopolies, which in reality are in danger, if drawn to the broad daylight and handled by the Socialists; they act according to the old jesuitic stratagem: invent lies and pollute your enemy every way you can; something will stick. But if we find those reproaches repeated and echoed even by workingmen, whose interests are quite different, we must wonder indeed.

If the workers, however, hate and attack Socialism, it is not a clear perception of the wickedness of the aims of Socialism, by which their judgement is guided, but a dim and vague idea, and it is well known that spectres are awful things in the dark, for people who believe in them.

But everybody ought to know what he does, and if he hates and persecutes other people for their purposes and pursuits, he must be convinced, that he is right in doing so. For, if we hate and persecute persons, whose purposes and pursuits are reasonable and right, we are wrong.

For this reason let us examine the real aims of the Socialists. I think, I know them pretty well, and I promise to tell the truth, and nothing but the truth about them, bearing in mind what the poet says:

“He who lies must have a flogging.”

When you have read this little pamphlet to the end, you may persecute the Socialists with renewed hatred, if you find, they are bad; on the other hand, you will think favorably of them, if you find good and right what they have in view. For I am convinced, that you, dear reader, whoever you are, have not a mind to love the bad and hate the good.

Foremost and above all, it seems to be certain, that the Socialists intend to divide all property. Everybody, who owns something, must give up what he owns; this whole mass has to be divided equally among all the people and each person may use his part, just as he likes. After a while, when some have used up their allotted part, and a new disproportion of property has arisen, a new division will be made—and so on.— Especially the money and the soil are to be divided.— That is, what some people say concerning Socialism.

Now, tell me honestly, reader, have you ever seen or heard of a man of sound mind, who really demanded such nonsense? No, you have not! Such a demand involves the highest degree of craziness. Just reflect, dear reader, to whose lot, for instance, should a railroad fall? Who should have the rails, or a locomotive, or a car? And since everybody would have a right to demand an equal share, all these things would have to be broken and smashed up, and one would get a broken axletree, another the door of a railroad-car, or some bolts, or, perhaps, a part of a dunghill. Not even lunatics could recommend such a state of things.

A division of money or soil might possibly be thought of, but money and soil form only a small part of the wealth of a country. The ready money forms even a very small part. And if the soil should be divided, all the new owners would be in need of houses, barns, stables, agricultural implements of all kind. Such a distribution of the soil is, therefore, utterly impossible, and the Socialists know well enough, that such a proceeding would benefit nobody. During the great French revolution in 1789 something similar has been tried; large estates were divided among poor country-people, to make them happy. What is the result? The French peasantry, generally, are so poor, that millions of them live in dwellings with only a door and no window at all, or with only one small window at the side of the door. And small farmers are not much better of in any country, except, perhaps, in the vicinity of large cities: The small farmer must, as a rule, toil harder than any other person, to make a living, and a very scanty and poor one at that, in most cases. Farming, in our age, only pays well, if done on a large scale, if large tracts of land can be cultivated with the aid of machinery and the application of all modern improvements. And this knowledge and doctrine of the Socialists is strictly opposed to a division of the soil. On the contrary, the Socialists are of the opinion, that there will be a time, when a number of small farmers will unite to cultivate their farms in common, and divide the products among themselves, seeing, that farming on a small scale cannot compete with farming on a large scale, the same way, as manufacturing on a small scale cannot compete with manufacturing on a large scale. Therefore, what has been said about the intention of the Socialists with respect to dividing the soil, is an apparent falsehood.

Concerning the division of money I must relate an anecdote, invented to ridicule people, who were represented to have such intentions. One day in 1848, as the story goes, Baron Rothschild took a walk on the Commons at Frankfort on the Main. Two laborers met him and accosted him thus: "Baron, you are a rich man; we want to divide with you." Baron Rothschild, not the least puzzled, took out his purse goodhumouredly and answered: "Certainly! We can do that business on the spot. The account is easily made. I own 40 millions of florins; there are 40 millions of Germans. Consequently each German has to receive one florin; here is your share;" and giving one florin to each one of the la-

borers, who looked at their money quite confused, walked off smiling.

This teaches that the division of money is but an idle invention.

And with a little brain and thought, everybody must be easily come to the conclusion, that the great number of those, who confess to the principles of Socialism cannot possibly consist of block-heads or rather lunatics, which they would prove to be, if they demanded such nonsense. In Germany 400,000 voters voted the socialistic ticket — should they all be crazy?

Therefore, there must be something else in Socialism. The number of Socialists in Germany is constantly growing. Even Prince Bismark confesses that. There must be something in it.

Now, if we go to the meetings of the Socialists, if we read their papers and pamphlets, what do we find?

They do not intend to introduce division of property; on the contrary, they are for abolishing its division.

That sounds strange, but it is so.

The Socialists are of the opinion, that division of property is flourishing in our society at present, and further they are of the opinion, that this division is carried on in a very unjust manner. If you doubt, only think of our Belknaps, Goulds, Crooked-Whiskey-men etc., and say, whether those fellows did or did not understand to divide and to appropriate to themselves large sums of money. Think of those swindling Railroad- and other Companies. How many honest mechanics, farmers, laborers, have been swindled by them out of the little sums they had gathered by hard work and saving?

The Socialists do not claim the honor of being the first to discover, that this kind of distribution is going on everywhere throughout the world, they have learned it. Men who belong to their adversaries, have taught them. John Stuart Mill, that celebrated Englishman, who is opposed to Socialism, says in one of his writings: "As it is now, the product of labor is distributed in almost an inverse ratio, those getting the largest parts, who never worked any; the next largest portions fall to those, whose work is, so to say, only nominal, and so forth; the recompensation for work shrinking in the ratio, as work becomes harder and more disagreeable, until at last the most defatigating and exhausting physical labor cannot count with certainty on gaining even the most necessary means for existence.

This sounds really dreadful, but if you look around and consult your own experience, is it not so? Certainly, it is!

There are people, who have a princely income, who plunge from one pleasure into another — and perhaps they have never in their life done the least useful thing; they need not work, they do not work themselves, but — they draw the proceeds of the work of other people and enjoy them.

On the other hand, look at him, who "eats his bread in the

sweat of his brow," look at the laborer who works for wages. If he is skillful, industrious and strong, and if he is lucky enough to find employment, he may even be able to save a little. But the large majority of laborers cannot even think of that, in spite of all hardships they undergo. When they have to stop work, they are as poor as when they began it. And many, many laborers, hardtoiling men, are not able to protect themselves and their families from exposure and hunger. You need not go far, reader, you will find them everywhere. Ragged, palefaced, despairing people will meet your vision, and on inquiring you will learn, that they were industrious, orderly workers, and that there are thousands, aye hundreds of thousands of people living in the same miserable condition, in the cities as well as in the country.

Now look at the mechanics! A few of them may succeed; they may be able to reach a state, in which they are safe from sorrow and care for the necessities of life. The greater number of mechanics, who have a little shop of their own and work on a small scale, have to battle with poverty and care. Thousands, hundreds of thousands of mechanics fail in this battle; they give up their small establishment and turn wages-laborers. One manufacturer on a large scale deprives hundreds of small mechanics of their independent existence. As things stand to day, only those will succeed in the great struggle for life, in the universal competition, who command large means, a great amount of capital.

In commerce it is the same: merchants with small means rarely do a good business, many go bankrupt, merchants with large means grow richer and richer. It is similar with farmers throughout the civilized countries of Europe, though not so much in North-America. Owners of small farms just eke out a scanty living and have to work very hard; many gradually fall off: in general the peasantry get poorer. There is the usurer, who knows how to make profit of a poor crop. Very frequently we find, that small farms are bought by owners of large farms to be united with them. Only the latter understand and are able to farm with profit.

Thus we see, how the large class of those, who work hard and assiduously, do not make money, do not amass riches, on the contrary, many of them must suffer from want and care. But now, who creates those riches, which fall to those, who never worked, or whose work hardly deserves the name of work? Who else, but that self same workingclass?

For industry and work scarcely a living! Riches for those, who never or seldom did anything useful! Do you call that just? You cannot!

In England it has been investigated and calculated by order of the government, how much of the total product of work of the English people falls to the lot of those, who really work, and how much to the lot of those, who do not work. What do you think was the result? The small number of those, who do not work ($\frac{1}{4}$) draw more than one half, ($\frac{1}{2}$) of that amount, leaving to the large workingclass only $\frac{1}{4}$, not even one half of that, what is pro-

duced by them. Now, if the government of our country or any other part of the world would order a similar calculation to be made, the result would prove the same.

Can you approve of such a state of things? I know, you cannot. No sensible man can approve of it. And now say what you may against Socialists — in this point they are right: This state of things cannot and must not continue. It is wrong, and therefore it must be changed. Socialists do not object to acquisitions made by honest work, on the contrary, they try to secure the product of work to the worker himself, and to protect it from the clutches of those, who hitherto have been accustomed, not to work themselves, but only, to draw profit from the work of others, and who, in doing so, are not content with a small part, but try to take the lions share, as it is in the fable.

But do the Socialists not go too far in their zeal? It would, certainly, be well and just, if it could be accomplished, that those who toil and work, could be liberated from care and want, and those who have been idle so far, could be forced to work also. But are not the Socialists enemies of the property-holders, and is not everybody, who owns property, threatened to loose it by the Socialists, should they come into power — so much so, that he would have to face penury and want? *Are they not Communists?*

These objections and reproaches have been made and are made. Let us not make light of them, but let us consider them quietly, in order to judge right and justly.

Before we go on, we must explain two conceptions:

I. What is Communism?

II. What is property?

About Communism many lies have been set afloat, especially by people, whose interest it was to do so, viz. by those money-making idlers, so that most people cannot, but connect with the word Communism the idea of rascality; communist and scoundrel of the worst kind appear to them to be synonymes. Therefore it is not an easy matter to speak of communism, without running risk to be condemned, before one commences. Many people, in such a case, will not hear, will not see, will not judge, — their verdict is formed. — All social prejudices are awakened and called forth by this expression. For that reason it is very difficult to come to a quiet understanding about it. But the reader, who has followed us so far, will follow us farther, not blindfolded, but using good common sense.

What is Communism?

If we open our eyes and look around us, we find many beneficial and useful institutions, brought forth by many, or by the whole people, *in common*. In one place associations are formed, for inst. to save and shelter shipwrecked persons; at another place the *community* erect a school, or the state, the commonwealth, builds a harbor or a canal. In ordinary life everybody cares for himself, but in such cases, as those just mentioned, people unite

for advancing a *common* purpose. Experience teaches, that, in doing so, they do admirably well; every one of them, who will reflect a little, must confess, that his own welfare is greatly advanced by such institutions of *common* usefulness. What would people be without *common* roads, *common* schools etc., that is such as are built and instituted at the cost of the *community* for *common* use? We would be in a terrible situation, if all at once the different Insurance-companies would cease to exist, whose object is, to transfer a calamity, by which a person might be struck heavily or perhaps be ruined, from his shoulders to the shoulders of many. If I chose, I could mention here a thousand other things, but the above named *common* institutions will be sufficient. Now, all these institutions are nothing but *Communism*. For *Communism* is nothing but the principle of *common* interests. In every day life everybody looks out for his own interest, even at the cost of his fellow-men; here cold, ugly egoism is dominant. The large cottonmills have ruined thousands and thousands of weavers; — but who cares for hundreds of honest, industrious, happy people, who get ruined by one mill? Who cares, how many honest shoemakers are deprived of a living by the large shoemanufacturers? What does the usurer care for the victims of his avarice? What do the speculating swindlers care for the fate of the shareholders, after their hardearned savings are gone? Nobody ever thought of caring for such things, and it is my firm belief, that a business man, in our days, who would show any consideration for the welfare of his fellowmen in his transactions, would be certain to become a laughingstock. Egoism rules supreme. Everybody thinks of his own welfare, and does not care, whether, by doing so, he destroys the welfare of others. “What business have I, to care for others, if I am comfortable.” In spite of the prevalence of Egoism, the *common* interest of mankind is irrepressibly gaining ground. More and more people unite to cultivate it, more and more associations are formed, the activity of the state and community is extending its influence over more and more objects. Who would have thought in former times of all the different associations, which are formed to day to advance any number of *common* interests of every description? Who had an idea in former years, that whole countries would be cut in all directions by railroads, that telegraphs would communicate news to the remotest parts of the world in an instant; who could predict the admirable development of our system of mails? Who thought of waterworks or of gas? Who had an idea of the modern arrangement of the fire department? The root of all these is *Communism*. They represent the victory of *common* interests over hideous Egoism.

To turn institutions of *common* interest to the use of all, is the tendency of the age, and however people may curse at communism, they are bent to obey its mandates. Everywhere *common* interests press their claims and *communism*, proudly elvating its head, marches on triumphantly with all conditions of human life in its attendance.

He who declares himself an ennemy of communism, declares

himself an enemy of common interests, an enemy of humanity and mankind! Whoever wishes to annihilate communism will have to destroy the common roads, the schools, the churches, he will have to destroy the public gardens and parks, he will have to abolish the public baths, the theaters, the waterworks, all the public buildings, f. i. city-halls, courts, all the hospitals, the almshouses, he will have to destroy the railroads, the telegraphs, the mail! For all these belong to *communism*.

Communism cannot be annihilated, it has its origin and root in human nature, like egoism. Everybody, who will open his eyes, must see, that, in the present time, we are under full sail to land in its sheltering harbor. Sheltering? Yes, sheltering! Sheltering for the great majority of mankind, for whom a better time will come, must come, when the common interest, the interest of all will be the rule governing all our vital conditions, when a barrier will be erected for egoism by the regard for the common or public welfare. If it happens now a days, that rich speculators charter railroads and occupy them by empty freight-trains, to prohibit others from transporting grain to places, where it is wanted, if people in such places have to pay exorbitant prices, or suffer, if the speculator makes use of the common calamity to double his wealth, or if railroad monopolists make their own rates for freight, injuring by high prices producers as well as consumers in order to gain a large dividend; or if storekeepers prefer destroying their goods to selling at lower prices, — these proceedings are considered "*all right*," for everybody can do with his own, as he chooses. But everybody must see that such egoism is opposed to the common interest; and there will be a time, when people will know, how to protect the common interest against such egoism. When that time has come, it will be better for all; all will enjoy life, not only those, who do so now at the cost of their fellowbeings.

If you define *communism* in this way, some of my readers will say, we do not object to it, quite in the contrary, we must confess to belong to the Communists ourselves. But this is not, what people *generally* understand by the term "*Communism*." We were to consider the communism, which the Communists and Socialists want to introduce, the communism with regard to property. We admit, that they do not intend to divide — but do they not intend to abolish property? This is, what we oppose, otherwise we would not object to it.

What is property? "To be sure, that, what a person owns, possesses!" Well! But, now, tell me, are you certain, that the Socialists are, or ever were, opposed to what Peter or Paul owns? Can you show me a sentence or passage from any of all the writings or pamphlets of Socialists, which justifies the supposition, that they intend to attack the property of any person?

You cannot, because such an idea never entered the head of a Socialist. I should not wonder, if you yourself have not thought sometimes, considering the means and ways, by which many a mass their riches, it would be only just and right, to take that

illgotten wealth from the rascally owner, but it is a firm principle of Socialism, never to mingle with personal property, in order to investigate its origin, or to arrange it in a different way. Never and nowhere! And whoever asserts to the contrary, either does not know the principles of Socialism or willingly and knowingly asserts an untruth. The Socialists deem an investigation into the origin of an acknowledged personal property an unnecessary trouble. They do not envy Astor or Stewart or any other of your money-kings for their wealth. Although they perceive very well the constant flux and the changes with regard to property, although they investigate and are acquainted with the causes producing those changes, although they are well aware, that fraud and meanness and violence in a great many instances are among those causes; they forbear to investigate, in how much these causes, in how much others, have influenced the state of property of this or that single person. They consider the personal property an accomplished fact, and respect it, so much so, that they consider stealing a crime. Everytime, revolution was victorious in Paris, bills were seen at the streetcorners, threatening death to thieves. At Lyons during an insurrection of laborers, in 1832, a man, who had appropriated an other man's property, was shot by another laborer in command. During the reign of the Commune of 1871 Paris had no thieves, no prostitutes. A remarkable fact is, that Baron Rothschild fled suddenly from Paris, as soon as those above mentioned bills were posted.

On the other hand, the right of the owner is not always respected in our time, but they are not Socialists, who violate the sanctity of property in these cases, although it must be confessed that in many instances an abrogation of the right of a property-holder becomes necessary, Socialists cannot be reproached with ever having condemned houses or tracts of land for the purpose of opening a street or building a railroad. They certainly are not Socialists, who seize and sell houses or lots at auction for unpaid taxes. Nor will you find Socialists, who connive at those shamefully unjust appropriations of the property of others, which however go on in a lawful form.

One thing, however, calls forth all the energy of the Socialists, and they will try with all their might to remedy it. I have stated already, they do not care, whether a person owns hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars, whether that person makes use of his money one way or the other, whether he spends it wisely or foolishly. He may spend his own as he chooses. But—these sums of money are not used simply to be spend, but to bring interest, to increase, if possible, the wealth of the possessor. Does he himself want to work, to do something useful? Far from it. His money works for him, his money generates money, as the saying is, or in plain English: his money is the channel, through which the earnings of other, industrious people, flow into his pockets. Socialists call all kind of property in this respect "capital," this expression comprising all means for production, and because one class of the people possess, by their wealth, these means, the capital—, an-

other, and by far the larger class, have only their physical or mental strength and skill for labor, *hence the capital becomes a means for enslaving workers*, forcing them to give up a part of what they have produced to him, who owns the capital. They themselves obtain hardly enough to support themselves and their families, while the capitalists enjoy life and get richer without working at all. This is the point. Dead property deprives living work of its fruits. Now since work should, by rights, own, what it produces, as its sole and legitimate earning, dead property becomes the bitter enemy of working life.

Hence the struggle of labor with capital.

Returning to the question: What is property? the answer given above appears unsatisfactory; we must add another question: *to whom belongs property, what the working part of the human race produces?*

The answer to this question is of the greatest importance. Now it is the capital, which appropriates the greater part of it, leaving to the workers, who form by far the greater number, only so much of it, that they may keep alive; they are treated like bees, that are robbed of the honey they made. This class is excluded from enjoying the blessings of civilisation, the greater part of their product is taken by the capital.

What right has the owner of a beehive to rob the bees of the fruit of their industry and labor? They are his property, his is the might. What right has capital to rob the workingclass of part of the fruit of their industry and labor? Are the wages-laborers, the mechanics, the farmhands property of the capitalist? *Are they his slaves?*

As things stand to day — they are! Might is right and by the title of such right the slaveowner considers the fruit of the work of his slaves his property; by this right, in former times, the feudal landowner made his serfs work for his enjoyment and benefit. Slavery is injustice, serfdom is injustice, so the right which capital claims to the work of the worker is injustice. I would not like to be misunderstood here. As far as anything is the personal property of a person, he may enjoy it, as he chooses; nobody has a right to interfere. But as soon as he tries to use this property to enslave other people, he steps over his domain and must be checked. For, I think, it is acknowledged among civilized people, that nobody has a right of ownership over his fellowmen. Slavery has been abolished, serfdom has been abolished, so the power, capital exercises now, will be abolished; its place will be occupied by the *natural and sacred right of the worker to the proceeds of his work.*

But — is not the capital as necessary as the labor? Can labor produce anything without capital? There must be raw material, there must be tools, there must be machines, there must be workshops, warehouses and so forth; there must be soil to be tilled etc. What can mere labor do without all these? True! Labor cannot exist without capital. But this is not the question. Is it

necessary that capital, {the real foundation of successful labor, and which has been produced by labor, be owned by a minority? Has this minority a right to continue to take the best part of what labor produces?

The Socialists take the side of the labor. They maintain, that it is everybody's duty to work, unless he be sick or crippled. They maintain that, whoever is able to work and is not willing to do it, has no right to enjoy the fruits of the industry and labor of others.

If capitalists attempt to justify their way of making profit, by saying, that they have to run risks sometimes, that a part of their property might occasionally be lost, we answer, that labor has nothing to do with that. The real cause of it is the competition among the employers, the custom to produce at random, without investigating, whether that, what may be produced, is really wanted. For the class of capitalists there is no risk, because its wealth increases every day. But there is a great risk for the working-class. When business is slow, when the wages go down, when many workers are out of employment, — when in consequence of this mechanics, grocers and even farmers suffer, the condition of the working part of the people is pitiable and many suffer. The newspapers tell about that. Have they not had startling accounts of people starving to death in our great cities? Look at the local columns of the daily papers and it is exceptional, if there is no account of some family or other being poverty-stricken, of people driven to despair, driven to commit suicide by want. And all this in cities that have stores and warehouses crowded with goods! Is this no risk?

But how could this state of things be changed?

This, certainly, cannot be done of a sudden. There is a natural process of development in this, as in all changes, that history has recorded so far. According to the reasoning of the Socialists, this development will be as follows:

Some time ago the middleclass formed the firm and solid foundation of society and state. Machinery was invented and a change occurred. Manufacturing, and even farming to a certain extent, were conducted on a large scale; the middle-class-people were pressed down into a class of wages-laborers, and were employed in large numbers by the manufacturers or employers. More and more this middle-class cease to be property-holders; it is getting more and more difficult for the mechanics and small farmers to hold their ground; thus the middle-class is constantly decreasing, the class of wages-laborers increasing, untill there will be only two classes of people — rich and poor. In this progress the number of rich people is diminishing, wealth becoming concentrated in the hands of comparatively few persons, who are getting enormously rich.

But this progress must have and will have its limit. There will be a time, when the large mass of the working-people will feel the consequences of such a difference, will find it unbearable,

will abolish it. That will be the time, when *communism* will enter into its rights. Labor will then be organized according to a certain reasonable plan, and since, for that purpose, the use of the existing capital, comprising soil, houses, manufacturies, machines etc. will be necessary, those comparatively few possessors of all the wealth of the nations will have to be expropriated. Perhaps they then will consent themselves to such a measure and give up everything necessary for production of their own accord, honored and praised for their patriotism and humanity, and remunerated deservedly; perhaps they will use their ample means to resist the common demand, and will perish, overwhelmed by the newly formed organization of the state. As I hinted before, in the new order of things all branches of labor will be organized, similar to the arrangements we see to day in large factories, large estates, or institutions of the government. Unnecessary work will be avoided and the reward for work done will be greater. It will be everybody's duty to work, hence everybody will have ample leisure for recreation and mental development. All will strive to ameliorate the conditions of the community they belong to; for, by doing so, everybody will improve his own private situation.

The basis of this state of things will be *communism of such property*, which is necessary for production and transportation, such as factories, machines, railroads etc., or which has been created for instruction and amusement, such as schools, colleges, museums, parks etc. Personal property will be, what is necessary or useful for private life. These are the outlines of a picture of future times. Nobody is able to state, whether the development will go on exactly in the way we designated; but that does not matter, if only the underlying idea of *Communism* is right. When the English engineer Stephenson, more than fifty years ago, built the first railroad, he certainly did not plan all the locomotives, rails, signals, stations etc. the way we find to them to day, but his idea was right, and it conquered the world. Thus the idea of socialism will conquer the world, for this idea is nothing but the real, well understood interest of mankind. *It is injustice, that a large majority, to day, must work hard and suffer want, in order to procure an affluence of enjoyment for a minority of people, who do not work.* And who would deny, that, if it is everybody's duty to work, if the production of unnecessary, nay even injurious articles is abolished, if production is organized in conformity with the real wants and pleasures of mankind: who would deny, that the standard of life of the whole human race might be raised infinitely above its present grade, that the great mass of human beings might enter the sphere of a life worthy of a human being, from which they have been excluded so far.

Let me point out to you an example of organized labor in one branch, to show the benefit of such an arrangement. How would it be possible to send a letter to any place of the United States for 3 cents, a postal-card for 1 cent; a letter to Europe for 5 cents, postal-cards for 2 cents, if the postmasters in the different parts of the world were private, like the merchants, manufacturers of

to day, if we had not the *communistic* arrangement of the mail? Formerly the mail was also a private business in nearly all the countries of Europe, like our express-companies and railroads, and the owners of this institution derived a princely income from it, although its use was very limited. And well arranged, as our postal department may be called — it might be better yet, and will be more convenient in time.

Similar benefits would arise from all branches of human activity. Look at our railroads — might they not be the property of the community at large, as well as the mail, instead of being a monopoly in the hands of private persons, whose sole object is to enrich themselves at the cost of their fellow-citizens? A good many persons cherish this idea, especially the farmers of this country, as is shown by the formation of Granger lodges, and it must and will be realized. In this manner one branch after the other will be organized according to the ideas of communism, perhaps by classes of people, who are far from confessing to the principles of Socialism, of Communism, by classes who are inimical to it — because they do not understand it, and are narrow-minded enough to shut their ears and their eyes to everything, that does not tend to their private interest. But never mind!

Do you not think that the express-companies are next to the railroads? To day they use their influence against the public, pushing through Congress laws for increasing the postage, in order to fill their pockets. So did the mail in former times.

This is not yet enough. All means for *transportation*, such as ships etc., must come into the hands of the community at large; so must all means for *production*. This demand of Socialism has been the cause for accusing them of hostility to property, even to the property of those, who own but a little. But who is it actually, who drives the owner of small means from his house, from his soil? Is it the Socialist? It is the large capitalist, the large land-owner! As the magnet attracts iron filings, so large capital attracts the small sums around it. And the same capitalists, who plie their tentacles in all directions, in order to seize, what they can get, try to persuade the small owners, to beware of Socialism, this being ready to tear their property from them. What a shameful falsehood! Socialism only teaches the way, in which in a future time people will try to reestablish justice and a more equal condition of life for the whole people, after the owners of small property will have been robbed of the little they owned, not by Socialists, — they have no power to do so, nor the desire for doing it, — but by the rich capitalists.

And this way is well-organized labor!

This certainly includes expropriation of those, who have expropriated the mass of the people, restitution of all means of production to the community at large. What benefit would it be to the community, to take wagons or carts from the farmers or draymen, if you could not take the farmers and draymen along? Nonsense! Talk of this kind has only been invented to frighten

people, who are easily frightened, and thus to induce them, to defend monopoly and wholesale robbery. Socialism, on the contrary, is the true and only friend of the man of small means, for it is the party of the working people. Large property is the natural enemy of small property, as long as it has not been able to seize and devour it.

Moreover, Socialism, far from intending to abolish any property to day or to morrow, only predicts, that there will be a time, not suddenly provoked, but brought on by historical development, when the working people will insist upon their right to the *product of their own work*, against the privilege, which property enjoys with regard to the *work of others*.

The conception of "*property of capital*" will be transformed gradually into the conception of "*property of work*."

Nowhere, you will perceive, abolition of property is thought of by Socialists, and nobody, I trust, will object to the change just mentioned. The development of mankind to greater perfection never was and never will be arrested by the prevailing laws concerning property, as for instance, it was not arrested, when humanity demanded abolition of slavery, by the pretended divine right of the slave owners. And if such rights or laws demand that humanity stop its progress, such demand is madness. Laws and rights concerning property are subjected to constant changes, when such changes are in the interest of progress, and whoever will compare our notions about property with those of antiquity and the middle-ages, will not fail to perceive, that a progress has been made for the better. But also in our better institutions injustice is ruling, and the change concerning property, just spoken of will abolish that injustice and lead mankind to a higher state of perfection. At the bottom of our institutions there is a remnant of slavery; as soon as capital will cease to govern, wages-labor and this rest of slavery will be abolished.

Freedom and equality will then be no longer empty and cheap phrases, but will have a meaning; when all men are really free and equal, they will honor and advance one another. The working man will then no longer be deprived of the fruit of his work, his property, and everybody who will work, will be able to spend a good deal more for food, clothing, lodging, recreation, pleasure and instruction, than he can spend at present.

That would be all right and well, if the Socialists only did not intend to introduce community of women or "Free love," as some call it. Would that not be horrible? It would indeed! But do the Socialists really intend to introduce such a state of society, in which every man has a right to every woman?

Such a state Socialists abhor even more than those, who invented that incrimination,

Let me explain, what the Socialists think about the relation of the sexes.

The union of the sexes is elevated and sanctified by love, by

mutual inclination and esteem. But, alas! in a great many cases it is not love, that ties the hymenal knot, it is "money" or some other "consideration," that makes marriages. How often, therefore, do we find dissatisfaction, unhappiness between husband and wife, shortly after the wedding! How often have marriages been annulled, because the couples found it unbearable to live with each other. How many more would be divorced, if there were not insurpassable obstacles, put up by church, state or society, which prevent them from doing so.

Now it is the firm belief of the Socialists, that it would indicate a higher moral standard in man, if money or any other outside consideration were not his guide in marrying, and if it was made easier for unhappily married people to obtain a divorce. For, what good can come from a union, which has to be sustained by force?

Now, where is the crime involved in such belief?

If it is beastly to dethrone in marriage the money or personal profits, to replace love to her righteous place again — the Socialists may be called beasts. They will stand by their belief, that, if two people are united by real love, their union is sacred by that love; if there is no love — you may as well dissolve the outward tie. This persuasion Socialists share with the most enlightened spirits, with the greatest poets and philosophers. If there is anything criminal or sinful in it, you must no longer venerate those honored men, you will have to break their statues and burn their books. As long as you not do that, socialists will stick to their tenet: There is no power to be acknowledged in a moral intercourse of the sexes but "*Love*."

For this reason the socialists are open and irreconcilable enemies of prostitution. This is one of the blackest spots, disgracing modern society and there will — there must be a time, when neither poverty or rudeness forces a girl to become a prostitute nor the gold or high position of those in power will be able to break a human flower.

And now, open your eyes and look about! Who is it that strives to keep up a happy family-life? Who else, but the working-class, although it is very difficult in many instances! If the parents, father and mother, have been out all day to work, to procure a scanty living; if they return towards night weary, exhausted, there is not much occasion for the development of homebliss. And now, the children! All day they are in the street, left to themselves; at night they will get a scolding or a flogging by the angry parents, when these become cognizant of this or that naughtiness, committed by them. No education! The place of filial and parental love is in many cases taken by indifference or hatred! What will, what can become of children brought up in this way? If taken care of, they might have become useful members of human society; as it is, many of them turn criminals. Do you think, the poor workman does not feel that, would not like to help and prevent it, if it were in his power? Verily it is high time for remedy! But a

majority of the working-class succeed in seeing their efforts crowned, they lead a happy family-life. If they do not succeed — whose fault is it? Is it the fault of the Socialists?

If a rich man keeps a mistress, if his gold enriches the keepers of bad houses, is it the fault of the Socialists that his family-life is destroyed?

Immorality elevates its head, to day, nursed by the passions and lust of rich idlers. It will be the task of the workers to extract humanity out of that filthy pool. In this case it is also communism, which will bring a remedy. When the working people enjoy the protection of their property, when nobody is under the ban of want, if he is willing to work, — nothing but mutual inclination will unite husband and wife, nobody will be able to buy love, — mistresses, and prostitutes will disappear. If, therefore, there is a crime in Socialism in this regard, this crime is not directed against morality and the family, but against prostitution in all its phases, against the community of women, which is not unknown in our existing society; it is not exercised openly, but is not unfrequently even covered by the black robe.

This is, what we have to answer to the incriminations of our antagonists with regard to property, marriage and family. But before we lay down our pen, we must mention a few other points closely connected with the foregoing.

If the Socialists had nothing to offer to the suffering people, but the consolation, that Communism will bring help at some future time, when the conditions for life, nearly unbearable now, will have become quite so, this consolation would be poor. Long enough a future state of bliss has been held out to suffering mankind, in which they would be rewarded for all the wants and sufferings and pains of this world, and the time has come, when most people have lost confidence in such empty promises. They demand an amelioration, not words, not promises, but facts. They do not want to expect with resignation what may come after death, they demand a change of their unfortunate situation, while living on earth.

The Socialists and they only promote, as much as possible, the interests of the workers. It would surpass the limits of this little pamphlet, to develop here the platform of the Socialistic party, but we will have to consider a few prejudices, which are in vogue against the activity of the Socialists.

If workmen embrace the opportunities for getting higher wages, it is especially the petty-manufacturer, who thinks his interests hurt by the demands of the wages-laborers. He totally mistakes the real cause of the difficulty he is in. Overlooking the competition of large capital, which puts him into his precarious position, and against which his is a hopeless struggle, he turns against the wages-laborers, and finds fault with high wages. If he would reflect a little, he would soon discover his mistake. If wages are high, the prices of manufactures must be high; for if manufactures are cheap, no manufacturer will pay high wages; or: high

wages are only a consequence of a higher price of manufactures. Furthermore, if a manufacturer on a small scale has to pay high wages, his own wages will be high, for he does not, like the large manufacturer, depend for his income solely on his employees, but he is one of his own helps. But if business is slow, wages will go down and small concerns will suffer must. It would, therefore, be the real interest of such, who are not able to employ a great number of hands, to unite with the wages-laborer. Whoever works to make a living, has the same interest, that the wages-laborer has, and should assist the latter in his struggle for the right of labor against the encroachments of capital.

On the other hand, are the wages-laborers to be blamed, if they do, what all other people do, if they sell the only article they have for sale, their working power, as dear as they can? Occasionally they may raise a good price, and there may be instances, in which the petty manufacturer suffers. In this case the latter makes the observation, that his unmarried hands are able to live without cares, — *but the married ones?* — he overlooks them. And at all times there is a vast number of wages-laborers in a miserable condition.

The interests of all workers are the same! This is best shown by the fact, that in many strikes the petty manufacturers are in favor of the wages-laborers. Low wages are unfavorable to the farmer as well as to the mechanic, for, when wages are low, the struggle for economical independence is more difficult; large capital increases, and at the expense of small property. If all working people would only learn to comprehend the solidarity of their interest!

As it is with the increase of wages, so it is with the decrease of working-hours. Eight hours work a day is judged sufficient by physicians. A person that has worked properly eight hours a day, ought to have done his duty and has a right to request some hours for recreation, for instruction, and for his family. Those who are the loudest in complaining of the laziness of the workingmen, would soon make wry faces, if they were compelled to work only six hours a day. This decreasing the working-hours will better the condition of the whole working-class. Everybody can easily see that. Even in the country it could be done, although there such a shortening will meet with the greatest objections, and it will be done. What a great benefit will be achieved by this measure alone! Whole armies of paupers, tramps etc. will find useful employment, they will disappear and with them a great deal of mischief and crime.

Now if the wages-laborers of the cities and manufacturing places will be ready to lead the van in the struggle for the interest of labor, the rest of the whole working-class have no right to put themselves in the position of idle, indifferent, or even grudging and hostile spectators. On the contrary. It is the duty of the whole working-class to participate in this struggle, for this war is carried on in the interest of all workers, and the wages-la-

borers, who have taken up the gauntlet, are the Pioneers for the human race.

But in order to carry on this war successfully, the workers must be organized. Singly and isolated they are powerless; if all would unite for the same purpose, they would be a formidable power, which nothing could resist. You may easily break many single matches, a whole bundle of them tied together, you would try in vain to break.

With regard to this, the Socialists have the gratification of seeing, that their endeavors have not been fruitless. In Germany Socialism already forms a respectable power, which commenced to puzzle even the *great* Bismark. They have been able to elect nine representatives into the Parliament of the German Empire, who, by their untiring activity, by the speeches they delivered, have opened the eyes of hundreds of thousands of people in Germany. And who would venture to pretend, that those men strove for something, that was bad, that they betrayed the interest of their constituents? But not only in the parliament, in a great many municipal assemblies also we find members belonging to the working-class or representing its interests.

And all this has been accomplished in a few years: It is only 13 years since the labor party unfurled its banner there. And what has been tried and done, during those 13 years to suppress this labor-movement! It has been ridiculed, scorned, incriminated. Many of its prominent leaders have been put into prison. Many were deprived of their offices and situations, of their customers. In spite of all this it grew and thrived.

In North-America this movement has also begun fairly, having its origin in the gallant endeavors of tradesunionmen. They will transcend the narrow limits they made for themselves; they will expand and embrace the whole class of workers in this country as soon as they have overcome some prejudices, the natural outgrowth of their national conditions and then, perhaps, they will lead the van. I omit to speak about other countries. In England, France, Italy, Spain— everywhere throughout the civilized world Socialism has taken root. Everywhere it has begun the struggle against capital, monopoly, and classrule, and its victory is undoubtable. Concerning Socialism there might be said, what was said in olden times about Christianity: If it is bad, it will die out of its own badness; — if it is good, it will conquer the world, in spite of all persecutions!

And Socialism *will* conquer the world, its principles will carry the whole human race, worthy of that name, to a higher state of perfection.

Reader, you may judge for yourself and decide either in favor or against Socialism. If you think the aims and endeavors of the Socialists deserve your hatred, try to crush them; if, on the contrary, you are convinced, that they are good, that the Socialists endeavor to promote the happiness and welfare of mankind, join them! And if you do not like to act publicly, help them se-

oretly. Try to propagate their principles among your acquaintances, explaining them in your intercourse, destroying the falsehoods brought forth against them. Tell them, that Socialism is the true and only party of the working people. And if you are a capitalist yourself, reflect, how much nobler it is, to help to promote the welfare of the many, than to serve only your own interest, ugly and hideous Egoism.